

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on January 18, 2011. Claims 18, 20 and 24 have been amended, and claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 18, 20-29, 31 and 32 remain pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments, as well as the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in complete condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the application in this regard.

Claims 18-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Schiller, WO 01/00523 ("*Schiller*"), Tomonari et al., EP 0 599 364 A2 ("*Tomonari et al.*"), and/or both Schieferdecker et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0118076 ("*Schieferdecker et al. '076*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,294,787 ("*Schieferdecker et al. '787*"). While Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, Applicants have amended independent claim 18 to even more sharply define the claimed invention over the prior art of record and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.<sup>1</sup>

In particular, as the Examiner will note, Applicants have amended independent claim 18 to recite, as part of the claimed combination, that the support has

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action indicates that claims 18-29 are pending in the present application and stand rejected. The Office Action does not address pending claims 31 and 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the right to address any rejections of claims 30 and 31, should they arise, in a subsequent Non-Final Office Action since these claims were not addressed in the present Office Action.

a square contour and a support edge length  $L$  (see Fig. 2) less than 2 mm. Claim 18 has further been amended to recite that the cavity has a cavity diameter  $D$  (see Fig. 2) greater than 55% and less than 90% of the support edge length  $L$ . Support for these amendments is provided in original dependent claim 24 and Page 5, lines 9-11 and Page 8, lines 4-11 of Applicants' disclosure, for example.

The round or oval contour of the cavity, in combination with the recited dimensions regarding the support edge length  $L$  and the cavity diameter  $D$ , provides two advantageous affects. First, thin portions, and thus portions with lowered mechanical stability, of the support are reduced to the portions between the corners (i.e., the middle portions of the support edges), whereas the edge portions themselves are reasonably thick so that the mechanical stability is very good at least at those locations. Secondly, the recited dimensions of the support edge length  $L$  and the cavity diameter  $D$ , in combination with the round or oval contour of the cavity, provide corner portions of sufficient size for contact pads (5a, 5b) for bond contacting.

In the rejection of dependent claim 24, the Examiner asserts that *Schieferdecker et al.* '076 discloses a support edge length  $L$  less than 2 mm as now recited in amended independent claim 18. However, this is simply not the case. In Paragraph [0008] of the *Schieferdecker et al.* '076 reference, to which the Examiner refers in the Office Action, an epoxide resin edge of typically 0.1 to 0.2 mm is described. However, this dimension relates to the epoxide resin adhesive for bonding the chip (20) onto the baseplate (31), and not to the edge length of the support (i.e., the

edge length of chip body (12)), as recited in amended independent claim 18. The Examiner also refers to Col. 6, lines 10-13 of the *Schieferdecker et al.* '787 reference as disclosing this claimed feature. However, Applicants could not find any disclosure of a support edge length in the *Schieferdecker et al.* '787 reference so the Examiner's clarification of this alleged disclosure is respectfully requested, if it is indeed present.

Moreover, with respect to the recited cavity diameter D in amended independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that the *Schieferdecker et al.* '076 reference fails to teach or suggest this feature, contrary to the assertion by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 18 recites a combination of elements not fairly taught or suggested by the prior art of record and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 20-29, 31 and 32 depend from allowable independent claim 18, and further as each of these claims recites a combination of elements not fairly taught or suggested by the prior art of record, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable as well.

Application No. 10/555,713  
Amendment Dated 5/18/11  
Reply to Office Action of 1/18/11

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing response including the amendments and remarks, this application is submitted to be in complete condition for allowance and early notice to this affect is earnestly solicited. If there is any issue that remains which may be resolved by telephone conference, Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to resolve the same and expedite the allowance of this application.

Please see the electronic fee calculation sheet for the charge in the amount of \$130 for the one month extension fee as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.17(a)(1). If any other fees are necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment or fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

  
David H. Brinkman, Reg. No. 40,532

2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2917  
(513) 241-2324 – Voice  
(513) 241-6234 – Facsimile